



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/644,151	08/23/2000	Frank Dunne	PHB 34,383	1067		
24737 75	24737 7590 06/22/2004			EXAMINER		
PHILIPS INT	ELLECTUAL PROPER	CONTEE, JOY KIMBERLY				
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER .		
			2686	2		
			DATE MAILED: 06/22/2004	, d		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	<u>'</u>	Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
			151	DUNNE ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examine	er	Art Unit				
		Joy K Co		2686				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI INSIGN THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNI INSIGN STATE OF THIS COMMUNI INSIGN STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e nunication. 0) days, a reply within the sta atutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the ap	event, however, may a reply be tire atutory minimum of thirty (30) day will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered time the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>communication</i>	n filed 12 January 2004					
·	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	<del>_</del>							
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	e Examiner.						
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
11\□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
		by the Examiner. N	iote the attached Office	Action or form P	10-152.			
Priority t	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation of the attached detailed Office actions.	documents have be documents have be of the priority docum nal Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applicati nents have been receive ule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	<b></b> 0.40)	4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔲 Infon	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or r No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/644,151

Art Unit: 2686



## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## **Double Patenting**

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

 Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-22 of U.S. Patent No. 6,690,943. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they Application/Control National N

Art Unit: 2686

are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-22 of '943 encompass the scope of the instant application.

Independent claims 1 and 11 of the instant application disclose a broadcast system for communicating a broadcast message in a telecommunications system having at least one fixed terminal, including, among others, a first transmitter means, control means and a second transmitter means, wherein the broadcast message channel is connectionless.

The differences between independent claims 1 and 12 of '943 are as follows: (1) claims 1 and 12, specify a broadcast system for communicating multiple at least partially overlapping broadcast messages in a telecommunications system including, a first fixed terminal, which is analogous to the instant application's "at least one fixed terminal"; (2) '943 also specifies a "first broadcast message" which is analogous to the instant application's "the broadcast message"; and (3) '943 does not claim wherein the broadcast message is connectionless in the independent claims. However, '943 incorporates this limitation in dependent claims 11 and 22.

Accordingly the dependent claims of the instant application, claims 2-10 and 12-20 are similar to dependent claims 2-10 and 13-21 of '943.

Omission of element and its function in combination is obvious expedient if remaining elements perform same functions as before. <u>In re KARLSON</u> (CCPA) 136 USPQ 184 (1963).

Application/Control 1 hber: 09/644,151

Art Unit: 2686

## Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joy K Contee whose telephone number is 703-308-0149. The examiner can normally be reached on M (alternating), T & Th, 5:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 703-305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joy Contee

June 19, 2004

CHARLES APPIAH PRIMARY EXAMINER

CAssel